

<p align="center">Interview Summary</p>	<p>Application No. 10/566,270</p>	<p>Applicant(s) FUKUDA ET AL.</p>	
	<p>Examiner <i>Jun Li</i> Melvin Curtis Mayes</p>	<p>Art Unit 1793</p>	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Melvin Curtis Mayes.

(3) Sam Cheong

(2) Jun Li.

(4) Stefan Hordmeyer

Date of Interview: 11 January 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: of record.

Identification of prior art discussed: of record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: _____.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Discussed proposed amendments better defining the thermal stability of the ~~comp~~ carrier
Discussed the evidence and whether expected that combination of Al-Mg-titanate and feldspar would remain stable at 1000C for 100 hrs versus decreasing thermal stability of the references
Examiner agreed to further review